(d) and (e) Notices to some companies were issued between 1984 & 1987. for recovery of amount under Para 7 of DPCO, 1979. M/i. Pilford India Ltd. has paid Rs. 50 lakhs as per the diiection of the court. No ofner company has paid any amount till date.

Monitoring the prices of price decontrolled medicines

3276. SHRI M. KADHARSHA:
DR. (SHRIMATI) SAROJINI MAHISHI:

Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that his Ministry is monitoring the prices of price decontrolled medicines;

(b). if so, what was the price of G:avol Tabs Waiavin Tabs, Carisoma Tabs, Ifi-brium Tab.., Masse-Cream and Deflfen cream;

(c) whether his Ministry intevened and got the prices of any of these medicines reduced

(d) if so whit are the names of those med cines;

(e) if not, what is the system which the Department is following for selection of companies and medicine; and what a:e the details of that system;

f what ire the names of bulk drugs based on wh ch each of these medicines are manufactured;

(g) whether the ,e drugs are poduced in the country; if so, the names of producers of each along with 'he production of eich d ug by each producer during the last three years, yearwise; and

(h) what are the names of drugs exempted 'from p ice control along with the basi, in each case?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) to (e) As per the prov'sions of DPCO. 1987 manufacturers Of non-scheduled bulk drugs/ formulations are free to revise the prices. However, Government is keeping a watch and nas intervened, wherever found necessary

(f) The required details to the extent available are given at Annexure-I.

(g) Production of these drugs is not monitored.

(h) D:ugs referred to is the question are exempted from price control as per the recommedations of Kelkar Committee , except Griesofulvin.

COB licence to Cadila Labs

3277. DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: W.1I the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) when the Cadila Labs was granted COB licence and what were the facts of their ca.e and what were the conditions of COB licence;

(b) when the capacities granted under the COB were revised; and

(c) whether the same treatment has been extended to the units placed in simi-1 ir circumstances and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) and (•>) M|s Cadila Labs., Ahmedabad were granted a COB licence No. IL: 134(76) dt. 6.10.76 fo- the manufacture of certain drug formulations. The need for COB industrial licence under the IDR Act 'had arisen as the value of their plant and machine y hid increased beyond Rs. 10 lakhs. The annual capacities for various types of drug formulations were fixed category-wise on the basis of maximum production achieved by the company fo- each 'tern during the 3 years endinu 1975. However, the party had represented against the annual capacities fixed in the COB licence. The representation submitted by the company was considered by the Govt, and acco-dingly an amendment letter was issued to the pany on 28fh November, 1977 subject to the 'following conditions:—

(i) The annual capacity against each category of formulat'ons has been fixed provisionally. The final annual